Questions received from Vendor 1 – March 8, 2006

Q1 - Circulation of Responses to Questions [RFP, Page 1]. Will questions and answers be made available to all prospective bidders submitting inquiries? If so, how and when will they be made available?

Answers to questions from prospective bidders will be made available on the DHCD website – <u>www.dhcd.virginia.gov</u> – within 3 business days of receipt.

Q2 - Number and Configuration of Users [RFP, Page 3, Item IIA4]. Your RFP requires "*The ability to provide a minimum of 50 licenses of the HMIS software to users across the sate in the first year. Upwards of 175 end users licenses may be required in subsequent years.*" Would you please clarify the following?

Our pricing is based on the number organizations and number of end-users. To guide us in preparing the cost parts of our proposal, would you provide the number of partner organizations will be involved [*i.e.* a 50 user system may involve 25 organizations with an average of 2 users in each organization]:

[a] **50 Users.** How many partner organizations will be involved in a system supporting 50 users?

The expectation is that there may be as many as 25 partner organizations.

[b] **175 Users.** How many partner organizations will be involved in a system supporting 175 users?

The expectation is that there may be as many as 80 partner organizations.

If you do not have exact answers for the above questions, your best estimates will be very helpful.

Q3 - Approval for Other Projects [RFP, Page 4, Item III2]. Your RFP requires that, "*The Contractor shall secure written permission from the Department of Housing and Community Development prior to taking on any projects in Virginia related to computer or technology related services, but outside the scope of activities of the DHCD.*"

Is the RFP requiring that the winning bidder must obtain permission from the DHCD before it can undertake any other technology-related business in the State of Virginia? If not, please clarify. If our interpretation is correct, what is the rationale for this requirement?

The purpose of reviewing any computer or technology project the vendor undertakes is to assure the project doesn't come in conflict with the service level expected to be provided to DHCD by the vendor. It also is beneficial for the state in the way of collaboration.

Q4 - HUD Approved Systems Lit [RFP, Page 5, Item IV]. Your RFP states that, "*Contractor shall be on HUD-Approved systems list.*"

Are you referring to HUD's 2003 *HMIS Consumer Guide*, and a list of systems on HUD HMIS Web-Site [http://www.hmis.info/products_info.asp]? If not, is there another list to which you are referring?

Yes, this is the list referred to in the RFP.

Q5 - Interface without Cost [RFP, Page 5, Item IV]. Your RFP states that, "*Contractor shall be able to interface with MetSYS and Bowman's ServicePoint without further charges.*"

Are we correct in assuming that "able" refers to system features and capacities, and not the ongoing management of interfacing activities [coordination of imports and exports, data backups, data quality control, etc.]?

Yes, it is important that these systems are able to interface without costs for the development of new software. It does not mean the on-going maintenance.

Q6 - Organization of Proposals [RFP, Page 5, Item VA2c]. Based on our review of your RFP, we are currently planning to organize our proposal as follows:

- **Introduction** [General Preview and Cross-Reference of RFP and Proposal]
- **Response to System Requirements** [RFP, Pages 3 and 4, Item II; and RFP, Page 6, Item VB1d]
- **Work Plan and Qualifications** [RFP, Page 4, Item III and Page 6, Item VB1d; and Pages 4-5, Item IV and Page 6, Item VB1c]
- **Cost of Services** [RFP, Page 7, Item VB1e]
- **Attachments** [Appendix of Attachments as Appropriate].

If the above order of presentation does not suit your needs, please indicate your preferences.

This organization meets our requirements.

Q7 - Data Sheet [RFP, Page 6, Item VB1b]. What is the referenced "Complete Data Sheet", and where is it presented in the RFP [or elsewhere]?

Due to the fact that there were technical issues with the VBO site at the time of posting no attachments where available. Please see DHCD website for Data Sheet.

Q8 - Capabilities of Proposed System [RFP, Page 3-4, Item IIA and Page 7, Item VI]. Evaluation Criteria awards a maximum of 30 out of 100 points for "Capabilities of Proposed System and ability to interface with existing Homeless Management Information Systems [HMIS] in Virginia."

Are we correct in interpreting this 30 point evaluation criterion as coving "interface capacities <u>and</u> other system features [*i.e.* user access controls and security tools, reporting options, HUD required capacities, shelter management and bed assignments, assessment tools, end-user customizability, information and referral tools]?

If our interpretation is correct, what is the relative importance of data interfacing relative to other system capacities [*i.e.* interfacing will account for 10 of the 30 points]?

Q9 - Interface with Existing HMIS [RFP, Page 7, Item VIA2]. The RFP's Evaluation Criteria and requirements call for the "ability to interface with existing Homeless Management Information Systems [HMIS] in Virginia".

[a] Capabilities of Proposed System [RFP, Page 7, Item IVA2]. Are we correct in assuming that the only "existing" HMIS in Virginia are MetSYS and

ServicePoint? If not, what are the other systems, and how can we obtain information about them?

At this point, we are only interested in interface with MetSYS and ServicePoint.

[a] Existing HMIS in Virginia [RFP, Page 5, Item IV]. Are we correct in assuming that the only "existing" HMIS in Virginia are MetSYS and ServicePoint? If not, what are the other systems, and how can we obtain information about them?

Answered above

[b] Data Import and Export Standards. Are we correct in assuming that the preferred or required interface between systems will be compliant with the XML Data Exchange protocols developed with HUD support and funding by Abt Associates and the University of Massachusetts?

If this is not the case, what are the specifications for your interface requirements [*i.e.* data to be integrated, quality control, intervals of integration]?

Correct. The interface should be compliant with the XML Data Exchange protocols developed with HUD support and funding.

[c] Direction of Interface. Are you expecting one-way or two-way interfacing among systems [i.e. are you requiring only that data be imported from other systems into your selected system, or that data be sent back and forth between your selected system and other HMIS in Virginia]?

A**t a minimum a one-way pull of information from HMIS users throughout the Commonwealth is required.**

[d] Frequency of Interface. What are your requirements or expectations concerning how often data is to be interfaced among HMIS in Virginia?

A monthly data pull is the minimum required.

[e] Assignment of Points for Interface among Existing HMIS. How do you intend to assign evaluation points for the system interfacing options presented by bidders? If you require or prefer a two-way interface, are you assigning equal point to both import and export capacities? What other considerations will guide the assignment of points for this part of your evaluation criteria.

Points will be evaluated based on the total solutions offered. The evaluation scoring system does not assign specific points to specific requirements.

[f] Verification of Interface Capacities. What procedures will be used to verify existing or deliverable capacity to meet your RFP's interface requirements?

A demonstration of proposed functionality will be used to verify deliverable capacity.

Q10 - **Cost Information [RFP, Page 7, Item VIA4].** Your guidance on how you would like cost information presented would be very helpful:

[a] Timeframe for Cost Bids. What is the period of time to be covered by cost bids? Do you want cost bids for the first/setup year and one or more subsequent years? How many years should the cost bid cover?

Please provide costs for first year and 2 subsequent years.

[b] Cost of Initial System and Expansion. The timing of expansions determines cost and the comparability of cost among those bidding on your RFP. For

purposes of presenting comparable costs, is it best to present the costs for a deployment of a 50 user system during the first year, and deployment of a 175 user system starting during the second year?

Please present costs for deployment of 20 licenses for the first year, 16 for the 2nd year and 14 for the 3rd year for a total of 50 in the first 3 years.

Q11 - **Evaluation of Costs [RFP, Page 7, Item VIA4].** Your Evaluation Criteria gives 30 points out of 100 points to "Cost of Services".

Are we correct in assuming that the evaluation points awarded for cost are determined by a commonly used formula in which the amount of lowest bid is divided by amount of the other bids to determine the percent of maximum score awarded [*i.e.* $50,000/$50,000 = 1.00 = 100% = 30 Points, and $75,000/$50,000 = .66 = 66.67% = 20 Points]? If the above formula is not used, what approach does you intent to use?

This is the formula that the Commonwealth uses to evaluate costs.

Q12 - **Overall Objectives and Long-Term Expectations [RFP, Page 3, Item IIA4]**

Both the initial and long-term scale of your RFP is considerably greater than we initially expected. Does this scale indicate that the State and the continua within your state are considering the possibility of replacing either ServicePoint or MetSYS with the system selected by your procurement?

The Commonwealth's goal is to have an integrated, HMIS system that allows both local continua and the Commonwealth to track the status of its efforts to end homelessness. At this point, we are unsure of how to accomplish that goal; however, the possibility of a statewide HMIS system is an option we would like to have available for consideration.

would like to have available for consideration.

Questions from Vendor 2 – Received March 9, 2006

1) When is the expected award date?

   May 1, 2006

2) Please elaborate/clarify Section 3 statement #2 on page 5 in regards to getting DHCD's permission to work on other IT projects in the State of Virginia?

   The purpose of reviewing any computer or technology project the vendor undertakes is to assure the project doesn't come in conflict with the service level expected to be provided to DHCD by the vendor. It also is beneficial for the state in the way of collaboration.